DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 337 EC 306 425

AUTHOR	Regnier, William L.
TITLE	Caution Needed for Inclusion of "Beavis and Butthead."
PUB DATE	1998-04-00
NOTE	13p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (Minneapolis, MN, April 15-19, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Numerical/Quantitative Data (110) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Behavior Disorders; Behavior Problems; Grade 7; *Inclusive Schools; *Instructional Effectiveness; Junior High Schools; *Learning Disabilities; Middle Schools; *Outcomes of Education; Regular and Special Education Relationship; Resource Room Programs; *Team Teaching
IDENTIFIERS	Academic Accommodations (Disabilities)

ABSTRACT

This paper compared the performance of 22 seventh-grade controls in a traditional special education program with at least one period of resource room instruction to the performance of 22 students in a supportive inclusionary model program. In each group, there were 17 students with learning disabilities and 5 students with behavior disorders. Results found: (1) absences did not increase for students with learning disabilities who did not have resource room support; (2) students with behavior disorders in the inclusionary model earned more failing grades than the control group; (3) regular educators in both groups had a similar number of concerns about the progress of students with learning disabilities, however, students with behavior disorders in the inclusionary model were discussed more frequently at team meetings; (4) in both groups, the students with behavioral disorders did not complete homework on a regular basis; (5) regular educators in the inclusionary model made modifications as needed and without frequent prompts from the resource staff; (6) the number of inappropriate behaviors of the students with behavior disorders in the inclusionary model was higher than the control group; and (7) teachers in the inclusionary model were able to co-teach three to four times as many classes as the teachers in the control group. (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
REGNIER
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ED 419 337

·50· YEARS
1947 1997
WESTSIDE COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

CEC CONVENTION 1998

CAUTION NEEDED FOR INCLUSION OF "BEAVIS AND BUTTHEAD"

William L. Regnier
Westside Community Schools
Omaha, NE

Objective of the Presentation:
A recent study of middle school special education delivery services compared a traditional system to a supportive inclusionary model. Paired t-tests demonstrated statistically significant differences for students with behavior disorders in the areas of failing grades, bloc team concerns, and co-teaching opportunities. Modifications made and co-teaching opportunities were statistically significant for students with learning disabilities in the experimental group. Results suggest the efficacy of the inclusion model for students with learning disabilities if modifications are made and co-teaching is available; caution is necessary for students with other disabilities.

Rationale:
Since there are few studies to date on inclusionary practices at the secondary level, we felt our building and district could discuss the pros and cons of supportive inclusionary practices if there was local data to share with colleagues.

Background:
The Department of Education Accountability Commission granted waivers to two school districts in the state who would design a pilot. The purpose was to study delivery service models that were creative and innovative in serving all learners. Westside Schools was one of those districts selected.

Westside Community Schools, consisting of six early childhood centers, ten elementary schools, one middle school, one senior high school, and a Community Education Center are located in Omaha, Nebraska. Once a suburban school district on the outskirts of Omaha, Westside is now totally surrounded by the city. Today, Westside serves 4780 students in grades kindergarten through twelve and 292 pre-school children. While Westside remains a separate school district, the educational, economic, ethnic, and domestic background of the district's residents reflect the general composition of the residents of the greater Omaha population.

The Pilot:
During the school year, 1996-1997, the 44 seventh graders requiring special services were randomly assigned to a traditional special education program with at least one period of resource room instruction or to an inclusion model with co-teaching in the four curriculum areas of (bloc classes) math, science, English, and social studies. Our pilot's main thrust has been to permit the resource teacher and the educational assistant to team in bloc classes all day. There has been no pull-out delivery service for verified students.

The experimental group and the control group were comprised of 22 students each. In each group there were 17 students with a diagnosis of learning disabled, and there were 5 students in each group verified as behaviorally disordered. In each group a few (3) students with learning disabilities also were diagnosed with attention deficits. Each group had an equal number of male and female students. The control group utilized the usual comprehensive array of services.

Both delivery service models were involved in middle school teaming. The entire core team met twice a week to discuss student concerns and curriculum planning. At that time, academic modifications, accommodations, and options were shared.

The data was gathered by establishing a matrix listing important variables that contributed to school success or lack thereof: absences, tardies, failing grades, teacher concerns, incomplete assignments, modifications needed for success, and co-teaching situations encountered daily.

EC 306425

Action Research Conclusions:

1. Absences/Tardies: Students with learning disabilities in the experimental group (co-teaching) did not have a higher absence or tardy rate than students with learning disabilities in the control group (pull out). At first, special education staff in the experimental group were concerned since students tended not to bond with them as in the past. It is gratifying to report that tardies and absences did not increase for students with learning disabilities without daily resource room support. However, students with behavior disorders in both groups were absence and tardy to a much greater degree than other students in the study.

2. Failing Grades: Students with behavioral disorders in the experimental group earned more failing grades than those in the control group at the .043 level. Behaviorally disordered students in the experimental group continued to fail because they did not avail themselves of the modifications made and co-teaching opportunities.

3. Team Concerns: Regular education staff in both groups had a similar number of concerns about students with learning disabilities' progress. Student issues are discussed at weekly core meetings. The data shows that students with behavioral disorders in the experimental group were discussed more frequently at team meetings - a statistically significant difference at the .000 level.

4. Missing Assignments: Data analysis shows that in both groups, it was the students with behavioral disorders that did not complete homework on a regular basis.

5. Modifications Needed: Regular education staff took ownership of the students in the experimental group and made modifications as needed and without frequent prompts from the resource staff. This outcome was not expected. Students in both groups needed options for success; these accommodations were stated on the students' individualized educational plans. Paired t-tests demonstrated statistically significant differences in the numbers of modifications needed between the experimental and control groups (2-tail significance .008).

6. Office Referrals: The number of office referrals (discipline notices) for the LD students did not differ significantly from group to group. The number of inappropriate behaviors of the BD students in the experimental group was higher than in the control group.

7. Co-Teaching Opportunities: Teachers in the experimental group were able to co-teach three to four times as many classes as the teachers in the control group since they were not involved in pull out and tutorial services. This teaming of staff contributed to the success of most students with disabilities in a supportive inclusionary setting. The increased co-teaching opportunities in the experimental group both for LD and BD students were statistically significant at the .002 level.

Surveys:

Surveys from the teachers in the experimental groups were very informative. One half of the staff stated students in the experimental group could improve homework completion skills. The majority felt that some resource time/tutorial study time was essential for homework success. Regular education staff took ownership of curriculum modification and provided tutorial/extended day services. Teachers felt that students with more than one deficit area needed more direct services from special education. Staff stated the success of an inclusion/co-teaching model depended upon the collaboration and personalities of those involved. The regular education staff mentioned that the SPED staff in an inclusion setting should be flexible, organized, and easy to work with. Lastly, the surveys indicated that students with serious cognitive or behavioral issues would not be successful in this delivery service model without individual support.

Statistical data is available which presents student information by total population and sub-groups.

In summary, the results suggest the efficacy of the inclusion model for students with learning disabilities if modifications are made and co-teaching is available. Caution is necessary for students with other disabilities.

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-1.8824	2.088	.506	-3.72	16	.002
95% CI (-2.956, -.809)					

All Stats

-> FILTER OFF.
-> USE ALL.

-> EXECUTE .

-> T-TEST
-> PAIRS= absences tardies failures referral concerns misass modify coteach
-> WITH absexp tardexp failexp referexp concexp missexp modexp cotexp (PAIRED)
-> /CRITERIA=CIN(.95)
-> /FORMAT=LABELS
-> /MISSING=ANALYSIS.

t-tests for Paired Samples

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
ABSENCES	absences			7.2273	6.595	1.406
	22	.791	.000			
ABSEXP				8.3636	10.935	2.331

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-1.1364	7.004	1.493	-.76	21	.455
95% CI (-4.242, 1.969)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
TARDIES				2.3636	3.458	.737
	22	.591	.004			
TARDEXP				2.4545	3.876	.826

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-.0909	3.337	.711	-.13	21	.900
95% CI (-1.570, 1.389)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
FAILURES				1.3636	1.590	.339
	22	.534	.010			
FAILEXP				2.2727	3.411	.727

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-.9091	2.893	.617	-1.47	21	.155
95% CI (-2.192, .374)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
REFERRAL	Office referrals			1.4545	1.896	.404
	22	.543	.009			
REFEREXP				1.7273	3.225	.687

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-.2727	2.711	.578	-.47	21	.642
95% CI (-1.475, .929)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
CONCERNS	Bloc team concerns			8.1818	4.687	.999
	22	.047	.837			

CONCEXP	Bloc team concerns-experim	9.3182	7.147	1.524

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-1.1364	8.363	1.783	-.64	21	.531
95% CI (-4.844, 2.571)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MISASS	Missing assignments				15.8182	20.165	4.299
		22	.907	.000			
MISSEXP	Missing assignments-exp				14.4545	17.278	3.684

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
1.3636	8.572	1.828	.75	21	.464
95% CI (-2.437, 5.164)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MODIFY	Modifications required				20.5000	9.148	1.950
		22	.393	.071			
MODEXP	Modifications required experi				25.8182	8.444	1.800

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-5.3182	9.712	2.071	-2.57	21	.018
95% CI (-9.624, -1.012)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
COTEACH	Co-teaching opportunities				2.9545	1.397	.298

		22	.079	.725	
COTEXP	Co-teaching opport	experimenta	5.4091	1.894	.404

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-2.4545	2.262	.482	-5.09	21	.000
95% CI (-3.457, -1.452)					

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-4.4000	1.817	.812	-5.42	4	.006
95% CI (-6.656, -2.144)					

LD Only

```
-> FILTER OFF.
-> use  1 thru  17  .

-> EXECUTE .

-> T-TEST
->   PAIRS= absences tardies failures referral concerns misass modify coteach
->   WITH absexp tardexp failexp referexp concexp missexp modexp cotexp (PAIRED)
->   /CRITERIA=CIN(.95)
->   /FORMAT=LABELS
->   /MISSING=ANALYSIS.
```

t-tests for Paired Samples

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
ABSENCES	absences			3.9412	2.297	.557
	17	.439	.078			
ABSEXP				3.5882	3.692	.895

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
.3529	3.385	.821	.43	16	.673
95% CI (-1.388, 2.094)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
TARDIES				1.2353	1.678	.407
	17	-.213	.412			
TARDEXP				.8824	1.317	.319

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
.3529	2.344	.568	.62	16	.543
95% CI (-.852, 1.558)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
FAILURES					.8824	1.364	.331
		17	-.039	.881			
FAILEXP					.7059	.686	.166

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
.1765	1.551	.376	.47	16	.645
95% CI (-.621, .974)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
REFERRAL	Office referrals				.6471	1.272	.308
		17	-.146	.575			
REFEREXP					.5882	1.502	.364

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
.0588	2.106	.511	.12	16	.910
95% CI (-1.024, 1.141)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
CONCERNS	Bloc team concerns				7.5882	5.173	1.255
		17	-.159	.542			
CONCEXP	Bloc team concerns-experim				6.8824	6.214	1.507

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
.7059	8.695	2.109	.33	16	.742
95% CI (-3.764, 5.176)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MISASS	Missing assignments				5.8235	5.855	1.420
		17	.393	.119			
MISSEXP	Missing assignments-exp				6.2353	5.019	1.217

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-.4118	6.032	1.463	-.28	16	.782
95% CI (-3.513, 2.689)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MODIFY	Modifications required				18.4118	7.657	1.857
		17	.389	.123			
MODEXP	Modifications required experi				25.4118	9.414	2.283

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-7.0000	9.552	2.317	-3.02	16	.008
95% CI (-11.911, -2.089)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
COTEACH	Co-teaching opportunities				2.9412	1.519	.369
		17	.122	.642			
COTEXP	Co-teaching opport experimenta				4.8235	1.629	.395

BD Only

```
-> FILTER OFF.
-> USE ALL.

-> EXECUTE .

-> FILTER OFF.
-> use  18 thru  22  .

-> EXECUTE .

-> T-TEST
->   PAIRS= absences tardies failures referral concerns misass modify coteach
->   WITH absexp tardexp failexp referexp concexp missexp modexp cotexp (PAIRED)
->   /CRITERIA=CIN(.95)
->   /FORMAT=LABELS
->   /MISSING=ANALYSIS.
```

t-tests for Paired Samples

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
ABSENCES	absences			18.4000	2.302	1.030
	5	-.324	.594			
ABSEXP				24.6000	12.116	5.418

Paired Differences			t-value	df	2-tail Sig
Mean	SD	SE of Mean			
-6.2000	13.046	5.834	-1.06	4	.348
95% CI (-22.399, 9.999)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
TARDIES				6.2000	5.263	2.354
	5	.386	.521			
TARDEXP				7.8000	5.070	2.267

Paired Differences

Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-1.6000	5.727	2.561	-.62	4	.566
95% CI (-8.711, 5.511)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
FAILURES				3.0000	1.225	.548
	5	.280	.648			
FAILEXP				7.6000	3.647	1.631

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-4.6000	3.507	1.568	-2.93	4	.043
95% CI (-8.955, -.245)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
REFERRAL	Office referrals			4.2000	.447	.200
	5	.654	.231			
REFEREXP				5.6000	4.615	2.064

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-1.4000	4.336	1.939	-.72	4	.510
95% CI (-6.784, 3.984)					

Variable	Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
CONCERNS	Bloc team concerns			10.2000	1.304	.583
	5	.733	.159			
CONCEXP	Bloc team concerns-experim			17.6000	1.673	.748

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
-7.4000	1.140	.510	-14.51	4	.000
95% CI (-8.816, -5.984)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MISASS	Missing assignments	5	.467	.428	49.8000	11.389	5.093
MISSEXP	Missing assignments-exp				42.4000	14.258	6.377

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
7.4000	13.465	6.022	1.23	4	.286
95% CI (-9.319, 24.119)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
MODIFY	Modifications required	5	.691	.196	27.6000	11.104	4.966
MODEXP	Modifications required experi				27.2000	4.087	1.828

Paired Differences					
Mean	SD	SE of Mean	t-value	df	2-tail Sig
.4000	8.792	3.932	.10	4	.924
95% CI (-10.517, 11.317)					

Variable		Number of pairs	Corr	2-tail Sig	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
COTEACH	Co-teaching opportunities	5	-.186	.764	3.0000	1.000	.447
COTEXP	Co-teaching opport experimenta				7.4000	1.342	.600